

Chiral symmetry breaking and confinement in the heavy–light $q\bar{q}$ system in QCD

Yu.A.Simonov

Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics
117218, Moscow, B.Chermushkinskaya 25, Russia

February 1, 2008

Abstract

The effective quark Lagrangian is derived from the QCD action by means of averaging over vacuum gluonic fields. In the limit of large N_c and keeping for simplicity the lowest order gluonic correlator one obtains nonlinear equations for the quark propagator, exhibiting scalar confinement. Connection to the quark zero mode density is discussed.

1 Introduction

The chiral symmetry breaking (CSB) in QCD together with confinement are two most important nonperturbative phenomena, which define the structure of vacuum and hadrons. The simplest situation where both these phenomena define the dynamics is the system of one light quark and a very heavy antiquark, to be considered as a static source.

In the case of QED the relativistic system of a light and heavy charges was considered among other things in [1].

The Feynman–Schwinger representation [2] studied in [1] allows to make the infinite mass limit and obtain the effective Dirac equation for the light charged particle (this is in contrast to Bethe–Salpeter equation, where the one–body limit is not recovered at least in lowest order approximation for the kernel).

The attempt to extend these results to QCD [3] meets with serious difficulties, and one needs the real understanding of dynamics of confinement and CSB in their interconnection.

While confinement was explained recently as being produced by specific vacuum correlators of gluonic fields [4] (of the form of correlators of effective magnetic monopole currents), the phenomenon of CSB is still not understood.

In this paper we suggest a systematic method to treat CSB in connection with confinement. We start with the QCD Lagrangian and derive from that the effective Lagrangian of light quarks, assuming that certain gluon field correlators are nonzero, which are known to yield confinement (i.e. linear potential) for static quarks. It is not clear from the beginning what will happen for light quarks (with vanishing mass) and whether they would be confined at all.

Our main concern in what follows is to keep Lorentz and gauge invariance. The effective quark interaction is nonlocal and to have gauge-invariant equation one should consider $q\bar{q}$ Green's functions.

As mentioned above the simplest setting for which confinement and CSB can be studied in the gauge-invariant way, is the problem of a light quark propagation in the field of the static antiquark. To simplify matter we start with the Gaussian correlators for gluon fields and derive the selfconsistent equations for the light quark propagator (with a string effectively connecting it to the static source). We show that CSB occurs due to the string (linear confinement), which shows up in the fact that effective interaction becomes Lorentz scalar. As another evidence of CSB in [5] the chiral condensate is computed and shown to be nonzero. The strongly modified and extended version of this study in [5] contains also another derivation of scalar confinement.

Those results were derived actually for the case of one light quark (quenching approximation or $N_c \rightarrow \infty$). To treat the case of two and more light quarks the corresponding term in the effective Lagrangian may be studied, and one is naturally led to the equation for the Green's function of two (or more) light quarks. The study of two and three quark systems can be performed in the framework of the same formalism and is now in progress.

The paper is organized as follows. In the second section the general form of the effective Lagrangian for light quarks is given, and the equation for the Green's function of one light quark in the field of the static source is derived. In the third section this equation is studied and solutions are derived, which exhibit scalar confinement and hence CSB.

In the fourth section the connection of the chiral condensate to quark zero modes is illustrated in the framework of the present approach.

The conclusion is devoted to a summary of results and the discussion of perspectives.

2 Derivation of the effective Lagrangian for the light quark

To make discussion of confinement and chiral symmetry breaking fully gauge invariant, we consider the gauge invariant physical amplitude – the Green's function S of a light quark of mass m in the field of a static antiquark placed at the origin. The propagator for the latter in positive time direction can be taken as (we consider below Euclidean space-time).

$$S_{\bar{Q}}(T) \equiv \frac{1 + \gamma_4}{2} P \exp ig \int_0^T A_4(\vec{r} = 0, \tau) d\tau \quad (1)$$

The Green's function $S_{q\bar{Q}}$ can be written as an integral

$$S_{q\bar{Q}}(x, y) = \frac{1}{N} \int D\psi D\psi^+ DA e^{-\int \frac{F_{\mu\nu}^2}{4} d^4x - \int \psi^+ (-i\hat{\partial} - im - \hat{A}) \psi d^4x} \psi^+(x) S_{\bar{Q}}(x, y) \psi(y) \quad (2)$$

Since $S_{q\bar{Q}}$ is gauge invariant, one can choose any convenient gauge for A_μ and our choice will be the modified Fock–Schwinger gauge, namely for any point x one introduces the curve $C(x, s)$, $s \leq 1$ with the tangent vector $t_\mu(s)$ and coordinate $z_\mu(x, s)$. The gauge condition (for some general class of the curves $C(x, s)$ considered below) is

$$A_\mu(z) t_\mu = 0. \quad (3)$$

We choose the curve C to go from the point x along some path (to be specified later) to the 4-axis, and then run along it, so that $A_4(\vec{r} = 0, \tau) = 0$. In this gauge $G_{\bar{Q}}$ reduces to the factor $\frac{1 + \gamma_4}{2}$ and one can now consider the integration over DA in (2) as a statistical averaging process and use the cluster expansion [6], (a, b - color indices)

$$\begin{aligned} \int DA e^{\int \psi^+(x) \hat{A}(x) \psi(x) d^4x - \int \frac{F_{\mu\nu}^2}{4} d^4x} &= \exp \int \psi_a^+(x) \hat{A}_{ab}(x) \psi_b(x) d^4x > \\ &= \exp \left\{ \int d^4x \psi^+(x) \gamma_\mu < A_\mu > \psi(x) + \right. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\int dx dy \psi^+(x)\gamma_\mu\psi(x)\psi^+(y)\gamma_\nu\psi(y) < A_\mu(x)A_\nu(y) > +\dots\}$$

We have denoted the higher order cumulant contribution in (4) as ... and shall disregard it here, for the discussion of these terms the reader is referred to [5]. The first term $< A_\mu >$ vanishes due to the gauge and Lorentz invariance of the vacuum, while the second can be expressed through the field strength correlators $< F_{\mu\nu}(u)F_{\lambda\sigma}(u') >$ in the gauge (3) as follows

$$A_\mu(x) = \int_C ds \frac{dz_\alpha(s, x)}{ds} F_{\alpha\beta}(z) \frac{dz_\beta}{dx_\mu} \quad (5)$$

The representation (5) satisfies condition (3) for the class of curves C considered below. Using (5) one can rewrite the average $< AA >$ in (4) as

$$\begin{aligned} < A_\mu^{ab}(z)A_\nu^{cd}(w) > = \frac{\delta_{bc}\delta_{ad}}{N_c} \int_C^z du_\alpha \int_C^w dv_\gamma \times \\ & \times < F_{\alpha\beta}(u)F_{\gamma\delta}(v) > \frac{du_\beta}{dz_\mu} \frac{dv_\delta}{dw_\nu} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where ab, cd are fundamental color indices. The gauge-noninvariance of the correlator $< FF >$ in (6) is only apparent and one can introduce a factor, equal to unity in the gauge (3), which makes the correlator explicitly gauge-invariant, namely

$$< F(u)F(v) > = < F(u)\Psi F(v)\Psi^+ > \quad (7)$$

where Ψ is the product of 2 parallel transporters

$$\Psi = \Phi_C(u)\Phi_C^+(v) \quad (8)$$

and

$$\Phi_C(u) = P \exp ig \int_C^u dz_\mu A_\mu \quad (9)$$

where the path-ordered contour integral Φ is taken along the contour C .

Since in the gauge (3) one has $\Psi = \Psi^+ \equiv 1$, we shall below omit those factors. For the correlator $< FF >$ one can use the parametrization suggested in [7]

$$g^2 < F_{i\mu}(u)F_{i'\mu'}(u') >_{ab} = \delta_{ab}(\delta_{ii'}\delta_{\mu\mu'} - \delta_{i\mu'}\delta_{i'\mu})D(u - u') + \Delta^{(1)} \quad (10)$$

where $\Delta^{(1)}$ is proportional to a full derivative, its exact form is given in [7].

In what follows we shall consider only the term D in (10) since it contributes to the string tension, while $\Delta^{(1)}$ does not. Namely using (10) it was obtained in [7] that the string tension σ – the coefficient in the area law of the Wilson loop, $\langle W(C) \rangle = \exp(-\sigma \text{area})$ is equal to

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^2 u D(u) \quad (11)$$

Thus σ characterizes the confinement of static quarks, and our goal is to understand how the dynamics of light quarks is expressible through σ and whether σ correlates with CSB.

Keeping only the term D in (10) and neglecting higher order correlators like $\langle AAA \rangle$, one obtains in (4) the following effective Lagrangian for the light quark:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{eff}(\psi^+ \psi) = & \int \psi^+(x) (-i\hat{\partial} - im) \psi(x) d^4 x + \\ & \frac{1}{2N_c} \int d^4 x d^4 y (\psi_a^+(x) \gamma_\mu \psi_b(x)) (\psi_b^+(y) \gamma_{\mu'} \psi_a(y)) \times \\ & \times J_{\mu\mu'}(x, y) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\mu\mu'}(z, w) = & \int_C^z du_\alpha \int_C^w dv_\gamma (\delta_{\alpha\gamma} \delta_{\beta\delta} - \delta_{\alpha\delta} \delta_{\beta\gamma}) \frac{du_\beta}{dz_\mu} \frac{dv_\delta}{dw_{\mu'}} \times \\ & \times D(u - v) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In what follows we disregard the perturbative contributions to $\mathcal{L}_{eff}$, since they have nothing to do with CSB. The mass m is supposed to be defined at the typical hadronic scale of 1 GeV, and we shall not be interested in its evolution to lower scales.

From the effective Lagrangian (12) in the large N_c limit one can easily derive the equation of Dyson-Schwinger type for the selfenergy part, which we shall denote by M and the $q\bar{Q}$ Green's function S . (We denote by S the form (2) where instead of $S_{\bar{Q}}$ only the parallel transporter is retained (cf. Eq.(1))). The definition and the diagrammatic representation of M is done in the same way, as in the NJL model [8], since the structure of the Lagrangian (12) is similar to that of NJL however nonlocal.

The main essential difference is the presence of the string, connecting the light quark to the static source, this part is concealed in J , Eq.(13) and

therefore the selfenergy part M is actually not the set of the one-particle-irreducible diagrams, but rather the $\bar{q}Q$ interaction kernel.

In the configuration space the equations for M and S are readily obtained from (12) noting that in the large N_c limit one has to replace a pair of ψ, ψ^+ operators in (12) as

$$\psi_b(x)\psi_b^+(y) \rightarrow \langle \psi_b(x)\psi_b^+(y) \rangle = N_c S(x, y), \quad (14)$$

and finally one obtains

$$iM(z, w) = J_{\mu\nu}(z, w)\gamma_\mu S(z, w)\gamma_\nu \quad (15)$$

$$(-i\hat{\partial}_z - im)S(z, w) - i \int M(z, z')S(z', w)d^4z' = \delta^{(4)}(z - w) \quad (16)$$

The system of equations (15-16) is exact in the large N_c limit, when higher correlators are neglected and defines unambiguously both the interaction kernel M and the Green's function S . One should stress at this point again that both S and M are not the one-particle operators but rather two-particle operators, with the role of the second particle played by the static source. It is due to this property, that S and M are gauge invariant operators, which is very important to take confinement into account properly. Had we worked with one-particle operators, as is the habit in QED and sometimes also in QCD, then we would immediately loose the gauge invariance and the string, and hence confinement.

3 Chiral symmetry breaking by the solutions of equations (15), (16)

As was discussed in the Introduction, CSB may reveal itself in the heavy-light system in two ways: i) as the presence of the scalar part in the effective mass operator M and ii) as the nonzero quark condensate $trS(0, 0) \sim \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$.

Both points have been studied in [5] using the relativistic WKB method and the presence of scalar confinement and nonzero quark condensate was shown as a consequence of the selfconsistent WKB solution.

In this paper we shall give another argument in favour of the scalar confinement, using an approximate asymptotic form of the solution of (15-16) at large distances.

The idea which enables us to find this approximate solution is based on the following simple physical picture. At large distances the string formed between the quark and the static source becomes heavy due to the length of the string even for the massless quark. Therefore the situation is similar to the case of the heavy quark, where the exact solution is known in the limit of the infinitely large mass, and one can use an expansion in powers of inverse mass of the string.

To introduce this expansion we first specify the kernel $J_{\mu\nu}$ in (15) and to this end define the contour C in (5) and the form of the correlator $D(x)$ in (10).

For the latter it is convenient to choose the Gaussian form,

$$D(x) = D_0 \exp(-\frac{x^2}{4T_g^2}), D_0 = \frac{\sigma}{2\pi T_g^2} \quad (17)$$

where the use of equation (11) was made.

To calculate $J_{\mu\nu}(z, w)$ we choose the special case of the gauge (5), which may be called "the planar gauge": the contour $C(x)$ is formed by the three straight-line pieces: i) first a perpendicular to some "gauge" plane, passing through the 4-th axis, then ii) a perpendicular to the 4-th axis, and finally iii) a cut along the 4-th axis to $x_4 = -\infty$. One can choose the "gauge plane" passing in the middle between the points $\vec{z}$ and $\vec{w}$ in $J_{\mu\nu}(z_4 - w_4, \vec{z}, \vec{w})$. To simplify calculations let this plane be the 14 plane, and then omitting for the moment the contribution of the cut i) in the integral (5) (we shall discuss its contribution below) one obtains the following representation of the only nonzero component of $J_{\mu\nu} = J_{44}$

$$J_{44}(z, w) = e^{-\frac{(z_4 - w_4)^2}{4T_g^2}} \sigma \frac{z_1 w_1}{2\pi T_g^2} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 ds dt e^{-\frac{(z_1 s - w_1 t)^2}{4T_g^2}} \quad (18)$$

In the limiting case when 3-vectors $\vec{z}$ and $\vec{w}$ coincide and lie in the gauge plane, the expression (18) simplifies

$$J_{44}(z, w) = \frac{\sigma |\vec{z}|}{\sqrt{\pi} T_g} \exp(-\frac{(z_4 - w_4)^2}{4T_g^2}) \quad (19)$$

We now turn to equations (15 - 16) and look for the solution in the form of an expansion

$$S = S_0 + S_1 + \dots$$

(20)

$$M = M_0 + M_1 + \dots$$

with

$$M_0 = J_{44}\gamma_4 S_0 \gamma_4 \quad (21)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_0(z, w) = & \frac{i}{2} \{ \theta(h)(1 + \gamma_4) \exp[-\int_0^h \bar{M}(h', \vec{z}, \vec{z}) dh'] \varphi_0^{(1)}(\vec{z}, \vec{w}) + \\ & + \theta(-h)(1 - \gamma_4) \exp[\int_0^h \bar{M}(h', \vec{z}, \vec{z}) dh'] \varphi_0^{(2)}(\vec{z}, \vec{w}) \} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Here notations are used

$$h \equiv z_4 - w_4, \quad \varphi_0^{(1)} = \varphi_0^{(2)} = \delta^{(3)}(\vec{z} - \vec{w}) \quad (23)$$

and $\bar{M}$ is to be defined from the solution of (15 - 16).

Acting with the operator $-i\frac{\partial}{\partial h}\gamma_4$ on (22) one has

$$-i\partial_4\gamma_4 S_0(h, \vec{z}, \vec{w}) = \delta^{(4)}(z - w) + i\bar{M}(h_4, \vec{z}, \vec{z}) S_0(h, \vec{z}, \vec{w}) \quad (24)$$

From (21) one obtains

$$M_0(h, \vec{z}, \vec{w}) = \frac{\sigma|\vec{z}|}{\sqrt{\pi}T_g} \delta^{(3)}(\vec{z} - \vec{w}) e^{-\frac{h^2}{4T_g^2}} N \quad (25)$$

where

$$N = \theta(h)(1 + \gamma_4) \exp(-\int_0^h \bar{M} dh') + \theta(-h)(1 - \gamma_4) \exp(\int_0^h \bar{M} dh') \quad (26)$$

To simplify matter further we take the so-called string limit, i.e. tend T_g to zero while keeping string tension σ constant. In this case it will be sufficient to consider $\bar{M}$ independent of time h' in (22), and one obtains

$$\int d^4 z' M_0(z, z') S_0(z', w) = \sigma|\vec{z}| S_0(z, w) \quad (27)$$

In derivation of (27) the condition $\sigma|\vec{z}|T_g \ll 1$ was used, i.e. the string limit is taken before any other asymptotics is considered.

The space derivatives in (16) can be shown to give subleading terms, as compared to (24) and (27), this is exactly the same situation as in the heavy mass limit considered in [5]. Indeed, inserting (24) and (27) into (16) one has

$$\bar{M}(\vec{z}, \vec{z}) = \sigma|\vec{z}| + m \quad (28)$$

At the same time the spacial derivative $\vec{\gamma}\vec{\partial}S_0$ does not contain the large parameter $|\vec{z}| \rightarrow \infty$, and therefore should be taken into account in the next order of the expansion (20). The appearance of the derivative $\vec{\gamma}\vec{\partial}\delta^{(3)}(\vec{z} - \vec{w})$ signals that the local approximation (23) used for S_0 should be in next orders replaced by the nonlocal form, which was obtained in [5],

$$M \sim S(x, y) \sim \frac{\sigma}{\pi^2 \sqrt{xy}} K_0(\sigma \sqrt{xy} |x - y|) \delta(1 - \cos \theta_{xy}) \quad (29)$$

where K_0 is the McDonald function. The r.h.s. of (29) is the smeared δ -function at large $|\vec{x}| \sim |\vec{y}|$, which should replace (23) in the next approximation.

One might improve the initial approximation (22) keeping in (16) the local form of M (25), (since it enters under the integral) but replacing $\varphi_0^{(1)}, \varphi_0^{(2)}$ in (22) by some nonlocal form. Instead of writing explicit formulas, one can obtain the simple static form of equation (16) if one integrates both sides of (16) over all infinite interval of $h = z_4 - w_4$. One obtains

$$[-i\vec{\gamma}\vec{\partial} - i(m + \sigma|\vec{z}|)]\bar{S}(\vec{z}, \vec{w}) = \delta^{(3)}(\vec{z} - \vec{w}) \quad (30)$$

where we have defined

$$\bar{S}(\vec{z}, \vec{w}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dh S(h, \vec{z}, \vec{w}) \quad (31)$$

Both equations (28) and (30) signify the scalar confinement at large distances, independently of the value of the quark mass m .

This statement agrees with the conclusion of the paper [5], where another, less direct method was used.

At this point one can compare our results with those in [9] and [10], where the limit of the heavy quark mass m was used (the authors of [9] have exploited the form (15) with S replaced by S_0 as the basic equation), and

at the same time to elucidate the dependence of results on the choice of the gauge.

One should stress first that the gauges used in [5], [9] and [10] on one side and in the present paper are different.

This fact does not play any role if one considers the total effective action, i.e. the form (12) with addition of all higher order correlators as in [5], Eq. (163). However the Gaussian approximation for L_{eff} and M , as in (15) depends on the gauge, or (if one considers the quark trajectory L with the line $C(x)$ attached at each point of L) on the shape of the gauge surface, this dependence being cancelled by higher order correlators. To minimize the influence of higher-order correlators one should choose the shape of the gauge surface as close to the real physical world sheet of the string as possible, and the latter is known to be the minimal area surface.

The situation here is parallel to that of the perturbative QCD series, where keeping a few first terms one obtains a dependence on the normalization mass μ , which should not enter into the physical result. The usual prescription is to choose μ in such a way as to minimize the neglected terms of the perturbative series and the recipe is to take μ of the order of the inverse size of the system.

In accordance with what was said above it is profitable to choose the gauge surface of minimal area, and our choice of the plane instead of the surface in [5], [9] and [10] strongly reduces the contribution of the spacial projections of the gauge surface. The latter enter in the final result being multiplied by the color-magnetic correlators $\langle F_{ij}(z)F_{lm}(w) \rangle$, $i, j, l, m = 1, 2, 3$. Comparison of (28) with the results of [5], [9] and [10] shows that (28) contains only the contribution of the color-electric correlator which agrees with that of [5], [9] and [10], while the latter papers contain also the contribution of magnetic correlators. Hence the color-electric contribution is surface (and gauge-) independent, while the color-magnetic one depends on the shape of the gauge and can be excluded for the best (minimal) choice of the gauge surface (the above is true only for the zero orbital momentum, otherwise the minimal surface is close to the helicoid, rather than to the plane, and the magnetic contribution survives).

4 Quark zero modes *vs* field correlators

We have seen in previous sections that the nonlinear equations (15), (16) give rise to the phenomenon of CSB, which reveals itself in our problem in two ways: i) it provides scalar confining interaction for the light quark ii) there appears a standard chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$.

A natural question arises at this point: a folklore understanding of CSB is that it is due to quasizero global quark modes in the vacuum. An exact relation [11] exists, which connects chiral condensate to the density $\nu(\lambda)$ of quasizero modes in the vacuum at $\lambda \lesssim m$, and in the chiral limit ($m \rightarrow 0$) one has [11]

$$\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = -\frac{\pi\nu(0)}{V_4} \quad (32)$$

Here λ is an eigenvalue of the 4d Euclidean equation for the quark in the vacuum field A_μ

$$-i\hat{D}\psi_n(x) = \lambda_n\psi_n(x) \quad (33)$$

The density $\nu(\lambda)d\lambda$ is the averaged over all fields $\{A_\mu\}$ number of the states λ_n per interval $d\lambda$.

It is a popular belief that the quasizero modes necessary for CSB due to (32) are descendant from the local zero modes on the topological charges (instantons or dyons), and their density is therefore proportional to the density of instantons (dyons). There are the instanton model [12] and the dyon model [13] of the QCD vacuum, which explain CSB in this way.

Whether these models are realistic or not, is the open question, but the Banks-Casher relation (32) holds independently of that, and if the method of the present paper proves CSB due to the field correlators (even in the Gaussian approximation), one should explain the origin of the quasizero modes in (32).

To do this we consider first the case of Abelian fields. As was stressed above in the paper, CSB is due to the correlator $D(x)$, and the latter in the Abelian case can be connected to the correlator of magnetic monopole currents [7,4]

$$\langle \tilde{j}_\beta(x)\tilde{j}_\delta(y) \rangle = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\alpha} \delta_{\beta\delta} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\beta} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_\delta} \right) D(x-y) \quad (34)$$

In the nonabelian case one can use the Abelian projection method (APM) [14], to separate out of the field A_μ and field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ the monopole and

photon part, and the part of "charged gluons". The latter contributes around 10% to the effective action. In this case one can connect the monopole current obtained by APM with the correlator D as in (34).

Now each magnetic monopole with the world line of the length T produces T/b quasizero modes, where b is the size of the monopole [15]. The interval of modes produced by monopoles is $\Delta\lambda$, therefore the 3d density of monopoles n_3 multiplied with 3d volume V_3 and with T/b gives the total number of quasizero modes in the intervals $\Delta\lambda$, i.e. $\nu\Delta\lambda = \frac{T}{b}V_3n_3$.

Taking into account that $V_4 = TV_3$, one has a relation $n_3 \sim \frac{\nu(0)}{V_4}(\Delta\lambda b)$. The last factor $(\Delta\lambda b)$ is equal to unity if the quasizero modes of monopoles are mixed due to interaction into the whole interval $\Delta\lambda \sim 1/b$. (As will be seen under this assumption one obtains the estimate (35) for the chiral condensate.) On the other hand one can estimate the 3d density of magnetic monopoles, from $\langle \tilde{j}_\beta(\vec{x}, x_4)\tilde{j}_\beta(0, x_4) \rangle$ integrating over $d^3\vec{x}$. (The correlator $\langle \tilde{j}(x)\tilde{j}(0) \rangle$ estimates probability of finding a monopole at the point x , if there is one at $x = 0$. Integrating over $d^3\vec{x}$ one finds the probability of having a monopole at $x = 0$, while another is anywhere; fixing x_4 means that the probability refers to a given moment. Note the condition on magnetic charge $\int \tilde{j}_4 d^3x = 1$, which yields the correct normalization.) Hence one gets an order of magnitude relation

$$\frac{\nu(0)}{V_4} \sim \int d^3x \langle \tilde{j}(\vec{x}, x_4)\tilde{j}(0, x_4) \rangle \sim D(0)T_g \quad (35)$$

where we have assumed for $D(x)$ the form $D(x) = D(0)f(\frac{x}{T_g})$ and $f(y)$ is an exponential or Gaussian with $f(0) = 1$.

Finally, taking into account that $D(0) \sim g^2 \langle F(0)F(0) \rangle$ one obtains

$$\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle \approx -\frac{g^2}{4\pi} \langle F^2(0) \rangle T_g \quad (36)$$

This estimate coincides with our result obtained from the quasiclassical calculation in [5]. Numerically (36) is $-(300MeV)^3$, i.e. a reasonable order of magnitude. Thus the very existence of the "wrong" correlator $D(x)$, violating the Abelian Bianchi identity may bring about monopole currents and associated with those zero modes.

5 Conclusion

The main question posed at the beginning of the paper –what is the explicit form of dynamics, i.e. equations for a light quark in the field of a heavy static source. The answer to this question is given by equations (15),(16).

Those are Dirac–type equations with nonlocal nonlinear interaction. We have shown that these equations allow for solutions which yield scalar confining interaction. Therefore at large (as compared to T_g) distances one deals effectively with a local Dirac equation with a scalar potential. This is in contrast to the QED case considered in [1], where the one–body limit yields the well known Dirac equation with vector Coulomb potential. The local scalar potential was assumed for the heavy–light $q\bar{q}$ system in [3], where numerical and analytic results for spectra and wave functions are presented.

The appearance of the scalar interaction provides (together with nonzero chiral condensate) an evidence for CSB, and the fact that these effects are proportional to the string tension, tells about interconnection of CSB and confinement. There are several direction for the extension of this study. First, one should consider the case of 2 and 3 light quarks and derive the corresponding chiral Lagrangian. Second, with CSB at hand one can attack the problem of constituent quark mass. These topics are planned for subsequent publications.

A large part of results of this paper have been obtained when the author was a guest of the Institute of Theoretical Physics in Utrecht. The cordial hospitality and interesting discussions with Professor John Tjon are gratefully acknowledged.

This work was supported partially by the grants INTAS 93-79 and RFFI grant 97-02-16404.

References

- [1] Yu.A.Simonov and J.A.Tjon, Ann Phys. (NY) **228** (1993) 1
- [2] R.P.Feynman, Phys. Rev. **80** (1950) 440;
J.Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **82** (1951) 664
- [3] V.D.Mur, V.S.Popov, Yu.A.Simonov and V.P.Yurov, JETP **78** (1994) 1
- [4] Yu.A.Simonov, Physics - Uspekhi **39** (1996) 313-336

- [5] Yu.A.Simonov, Theory of light quarks in the confining vacuum; hep-ph 9704301
- [6] N.G.Van Kampen, Phys. Rep. **C24** (1976) 171; Physica **74** (1974) 215
Yu.A.Simonov , Yad. Fiz. **48** (1988) 1381; **50** (1989) 213
- [7] H.G.Dosch, Yu.A.Simonov, Phys. Lett. **B 205** (1988) 339
- [8] Y.Nambu and G.Iona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. **122** (1961) 345
S.P.Klevansky, Rev. Mod. Phys. **64** (1992) 649
- [9] N.Brambilla and A.Vairo Phys. Lett. **B 407** (1997) 167
- [10] Yu.S.Kalashnikova and A.Nefediev, Potential regime for heavy quark dynamics and Lorentz nature of confinement, hep-ph/9707490, Phys.Lett (in press)
- [11] T.Banks and A.Casher, Nucl. Phys. **B169** (1980) 102
- [12] D.I.Diakonov and V.Yu. Petrov, **272** (1986) 457
E.Shuryak, A.Schaefer, hep-ph/9610245
- [13] A.Gonzalez-Arroyo, Yu.A.Simonov, Nucl. Phys. **B 460** (1996) 429
- [14] G.'tHooft, Nucl. Phys. **B190** (1981) 455
A.S.Kronfeld, G.Schierholz, U.Wiese, Nucl. Phys. **B293** (1987) 461
- [15] Yu.A.Simonov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **42** (1985) 352